ICTMT 15 GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The inclusion of papers and abstracts for posters/workshops in the proceedings require a post-conference resubmission of your paper or abstract that takes account of feedback during the conference and from this peer review process.

GENERAL RULES FOR SUBMISSIONS

The following rules apply to all types of submissions; full papers, abstracts for posters and workshop proposals:

1. Adherence to the conference theme(s)

Submissions should be about research and practice significantly related to the uses of technology in mathematics education. Moreover, proposals should adhere to one or more conference themes within the general frame of "Connections and Connectivity":

1. Designing technology
2. Making sense of "classroom" practice
3. Fostering mathematical collaborations
4. Innovating with technologies

2. Originality and contribution

Contributions should be original, i.e. not have been published previously, although workshops may involve bringing previously published work to life through hands-on activities.

Authors should refer to related relevant published research, state what is new in their submission and highlight how it builds on past research or suggests new directions.

Proposals that are too similar to submissions previously presented at international conferences will be rejected. We especially welcome proposals that represent new and potentially significant contributions to research in any aspect of technology use within mathematics education.

3. Contextualization

Since all development and research is conducted in a specific theoretical, scientific, and cultural context, the submission should briefly specify its context with an international audience in mind. For instance, while the use of English as a common language is often practical, it also necessitates vigilance to avoid implicit generalization, or suppression, of various local conditions.

The reviewer must check that authors make explicit the key assumptions underlying the design of the study. Authors should also explain why the work is relevant in their cultural context (e.g. pedagogy, research environment, country, educational system, etc.).

4. Format

The format of submitted papers and proposals for posters/workshops must be as specified in the relevant templates. **Only submissions using this format will be accepted.**

Submissions should be concise – a **maximum of eight (8) pages for full papers and two (2) pages for poster/workshop abstracts** – using the correct template. However, submissions must still contain all information necessary to inform both reviewers and other researchers.

5. Content

All types of studies are acceptable – i.e. exploratory, design-based, surveys, observational, ethnographic, experimental, quasi-experimental studies, case studies etc.

Contributions need not be limited to completed research. Authors may submit reports of work in progress, provided that some theoretical framing and outline approaches - with preliminary results, if appropriate, are included.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEWS OF SUBMITTED PAPERS AND PROPOSALS FOR POSTERS/WORKSHOPS

Proposals should fit the quality aspects outlined below:

1. The proposal relates to a topic that is relevant to ICTMT 15 and its main themes.
2. The proposal includes:
    a. a clear statement of the focus and rationale for the work that indicates the question or problem being addressed;
    b. an indication of the theoretical framework (or key theoretical constructs) that underpin the work, with references to the related literature;
    c. for empirical studies, a presentation of the methods used (including research aims/questions, criteria for the selection of participants or sampling, data collection instruments and procedures, data analysis procedures); and
    d. a discussion of (preliminary) results and the implications thereof, if appropriate to the reported work.
3. The proposal uses and adheres to the correct ICTMT 15 template.
4. The proposal uses and adheres to the APA referencing style (7th edition).

Reviewers are expected to make brief **comments concerning each of the above criteria** and, where needed, suggest related changes to the text.

Decisive overall recommendation

Reviewers will make a clear recommendation on each proposal, choosing one of the choices:

1. ACCEPT without further changes
2. ACCEPT subject to minor changes as detailed below
3. ACCEPT subject to major changes as detailed below
4. REJECT

Due to the policy of inclusion, the rejection of a presented proposal should be an exception. In all cases, please ensure that your decision is supported by your feedback to the author(s).

TIMETABLE FOR REVIEWS

Submission	Via	Responsible	Deadline
Submission of revised papers/abstracts	EasyChair	Authors	October 5, 2021
Peer-reviews	Email to raimundo@edu.au.dk	Reviewers	November 5, 2021
Reviews back to authors	Email	Editors	December 1, 2021
Submission based on peer reviews	Email to raimundo@edu.au.dk	Authors	January 15, 2022
Notification of final acceptance	Email	Editors	February 28, 2022
Publication of proceedings	TBD (likely Open Archive HAL)	Editors	Summer, 2022